

**From:** [POULSEN Mike](#)  
**To:** [Chip\\_Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Portland Harbor Round 2 data question  
**Date:** 03/28/2007 02:10 PM

---

Chip -

I'm going to send you a version of this question suitable for forwarding to the LWG. Either that, or Dana suggested that I give Laura a call. A somewhat polished email to follow.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: POULSEN Mike  
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2007 9:40 AM  
To: 'Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov'  
Cc: davoli.dana@epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epa.gov  
Subject: RE: Portland Harbor Round 2 data question

Chip -

I'm now looking at regression on order statistics (ROS), and have come back to this question. I can't find the data analysis used to determine the mean and other statistics for the Downstream subarea and other subareas. The report tables provide summaries. The best I can find on the CD is a 220 megabyte database. That's not what I'm looking for. What I'd like to see is a spreadsheet that provides the evaluation of the data in each subarea. Has anyone reviewing the report found this? Can you ask for this (or can I ask for this)? Thanks.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 5:58 PM  
To: POULSEN Mike  
Cc: davoli.dana@epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epa.gov; ANDERSON Jim M; MCCLINCY Matt  
Subject: Re: Portland Harbor Round 2 data question

My late-in-the-day guess is the difference could be whether the Zidell data set (category 2 data) is included or not. The lower concentrations are for n=17 vs higher for n=63.

POULSEN Mike <POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>	To
03/20/2007 02:51 PM	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip_Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
	cc
	ANDERSON Jim M <Jim.M.Anderson@state.or.us>, MCCLINCY Matt <MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>, Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
	Subject
	Portland Harbor Round 2 data question

I have a specific question to go along with my concerns about "upstream" data. My big concern is that contaminated sediment in the Downtown RM 11-15 section is affecting decisions about acceptable levels in the study area. We'll have to hit that issue head-on in some forum. But for now, I'm confused about the levels of PCBs (the big risk driver) in the Downtown area.

Figure 6.1-50 shows a maximum PCB concentration in Downtown sediment of 35 ug/kg. This is consistent with Table 6.1-5, which shows a mean PCB Aroclor concentration of about 20 ug/kg.

On the other hand, Figure 6.1-52 and Table 6.1-13 show substantially higher PCB concentrations in the Downtown area, with a mean of 280 ug/kg and a maximum of 7100 ug/kg.

I can't tell who is right. Am I missing something? Does it have something to do with post ROS data reduction? I doubt it, but I'm not sure. In the 1 March roll-out meeting (page 8 of the slides), the LWG showed a mean PCB sediment value of 280 in Downtown.

- Mike